

Remarks

The Notice of Non-Compliant amendment mailed July 31, 2006 indicated that in the response filed on July 24, 2006, "Claims 1-8 and 11-13 have not been provided with the proper status identifiers." However, claims 1-8 did have the proper status identifiers. In a conversation with the examiner on August 21, the examiner recommended refileing the response which had been filed on July 24. This is that response, with the same claims amendments and the same remarks.

Claim 13 has been amended to resolve the interpretation issue raised in section 1 of the office action.

Concerning the rejection over Bishop (US 6,695,967 B2), priority of the Bishop patent has been claimed herein, which resolves the rejection.

The remaining rejection is over Grangeon, US 5,824,220. Grangeon teaches sintering, not reaction bonding. Further, the inorganic binder used by Grangeon is either clay (see Example 1, column 4 lines 1-10) or TiMO, which is a two cation metal oxide. Grangeon thus does not disclose or suggest reaction bonding, nor reaction bonding using at least a non-oxidized element. As these features are present in all of the claims, the claims must under the law be patentable over Grangeon.

If for any reason this Response is found to be incomplete, or if at any time it appears that a telephone conference with counsel would help advance prosecution, please telephone the undersigned in Westborough, Massachusetts, (508) 898-1501.

Respectfully submitted,



Brian M. Dingman
Reg. No. 32,729
Customer number 28534